

**Remarks**

Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the instant application in view of the following remarks.

***Interview Summary***

On **18 April 2007**, the undersigned engaged in a telephonic interview with the Examiner regarding the terms “first passkey” and “second passkey” in the claims, and responsive to this interview, and at the request of the Examiner, on **18 April 2007** the undersigned faxed a proposed amendment, together with a request for reconsideration of the claims as last amended on **24 January 2007**, particularly in respect of the terms “first passkey” and “second passkey” in claims **1, 11, 13, 20 and 22**. On **19 April 2007**, in a subsequent telephonic interview, the Examiner declined to accept the terms “first passkey” and “second passkey” in the claims, but indicated that the proposed amendment to these claims was acceptable, and that he would allow the application if the claims were amended as proposed. The Examiner further requested the undersigned to file a summary of the interview, along with an amendment to formalize the proposed amendment that had been informally faxed to the Examiner on **18 April 2007**. No prior art was discussed. The Examiner agreed that the previously proposed amendment to specification provided on **5 April 2007** would be moot in view of the proposed amendment to the claims, and accordingly would not need to be formally entered.

***Claim Status***

Claims **1-43** are pending in the application.

As of the last Office Action dated 4 August 2006 (Paper No./Mail Date 20060718), Claims **1-43** stood rejected under **35 U.S.C. § 102(e)** as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. **2005/0020783 A1** to Fisher, or in the alternative, under **35 U.S.C. § 103(a)** as being obvious over Fisher in view of Raven [Program Codelock2] (by W. Raven Coons Jr., 1997). On **19 April 2007**, the Examiner indicated that the claims would be allowable if amended to improve clarity, and made no specific reference to any prior art. Accordingly, it would now appear that the claims no longer stand rejected over any prior art.